

REMARKS

Applicants have received and reviewed the final Office Action dated December 21, 2005. By way of response, Applicants have amended claim 1 and canceled without prejudice claims 14-25. Claims 1-13 are pending. Applicants request consideration of the following remarks.

For the reasons given below, Applicants submit that the amended claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a method of "imparting gloss to stainless steel." This amendment is supported by the specification at least at page 3, lines 3-4.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a method of imparting a gloss to a hard surface including "removing soil from the hard surface." This amendment is supported by claim 14 as originally filed and the specification at least at page 3, lines 19-20. This text describes application of a composition with components that are suitable in removing soil from a hard surface

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a method of imparting a gloss to a hard surface including "rinsing the hard surface." This amendment is supported by claim 15 as originally filed.

Applicants respectfully argue claim 1 and its dependents are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Perovetz et al. (U.S. 4,925,491). The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Sabde (U.S. 6,306,012). The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Darcangelo et al. (U.S. 6,375,551). The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-13, 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by US 20050126630 A1 to Swan. The Examiner rejected claims 1-16, 18, 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by US 4,978,469 to Seaman. The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by CN 1329121 A to Liang (abstract). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 1 overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now recites a method of "imparting gloss to stainless steel" comprising "removing soil from the hard surface" and "rinsing the hard surface." The cited references fail to teach or disclose each element of the presently claimed invention.

The Perovetz et al. reference discloses a silver polish. In particular, the polish composition that contains a suspended particulate in the form to polish silver (col. 2, lines 48-43). The polish is not rinsed off, but rather removed with a soft cloth (Examples 1-15).

The Sabde reference discloses the use of abrasives materials. Specifically, the Sabde reference discloses a chemical-mechanical planarizing process used to remove material from a substrate to create a highly planar surface (col. 1, lines 15-21).

The Darcangelo reference discusses using a polish to form a "angstrom level roughness high quality surface" in optical lithography fluoride crystal surfaces (col. 1, lines 51-52). This polish is used to polish a fluoride crystal.

The Swan reference discloses a method of injecting antifreeze into a plumbing system to protect the internal structure of plumbing pipes. The reference also discloses that the antifreeze can be flushed from the system with water (page 1, paragraph [0006]).

The Seaman reference is directed at the cleaning of sub-freezing surfaces without solidification (col. 1, lines 15-21, col. 3, lines 27-28). The composition is designed to clean soil deposits, and is removed by means of a mop, sponge or vacuum (col. 4, lines 62-64).

The Liang reference discloses a rubber tire-protecting agent and method. These agents are intended to protect the tire.

None of these references disclose a method of "imparting gloss to stainless steel." Moreover, the references also fail to disclose a method of imparting gloss to stainless steel that further comprises "removing soil from the hard surface" and "rinsing the hard surface." As such, the cited references fail to teach or disclose each element of the presently claimed invention.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing differences, it is submitted the references neither teach nor suggest the presently claimed compositions, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

Applicants submit that claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below, if the Examiner believes that doing so will advance prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: Feb 21, 2006

Mark T. Skoog
Mark T. Skoog
Reg. No. 40,178

